

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 23, and 26 are amended with this reply. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-31 remain pending.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification as originally filed. For example, support for amended claim 1 is found at paragraphs 20 – 25 for the structure of the oligoester and at paragraph 34 for the method of making the reaction mixture. Support for amended claims 23 and 26 is found for example at paragraph 46. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the McBain reference (U.S. Pat. No. 5,777,053). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the reaction mixture is formed by adding the diisocyanate to a blend of the oligoester and acrylate. As discussed in previous actions, the amended claim is novel over the McBain reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9, 13-28, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Bristowe reference (U.S. Pat. No. 4,213,837). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

In addition to the amendment discussed above, Applicants have further amended claim 1 to recite the oligoester is a condensation product of aliphatic diol(s) and aliphatic polycarboxylic compound(s). The amended claims distinguish over the Bristowe reference, which teaches that

the oligoester is made from a bisphenol A ethoxylate as polyol. The polyol of the reference is an aromatic polyol, not an aliphatic polyol as recited in the amended claims.

The Bristowe reference teaches away from modifying its disclosure to arrive at the subject matter of the amended claims. Its teaching is expressly limited to the polyol disclosed:

"It has now been discovered that certain vinyl ester urethanes having a specific number oxyalkylene units and other specific limitations possess a combination of excellent properties ... ." (emphasis added)

col. 1, lines 58-62. Because the "excellent properties" result from "specific limitations" as described with respect to the polyol structure, a person of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the Bristowe disclosure, lest the excellent properties and advantages be lost.

Because the amended claims are novel over the reference, and because it would not been obvious to modify the reference to arrive at the subject matter of the claims, Applicants respectfully submit the amended claims are patentable over the Bristowe reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 23-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the McBain reference in view of the Bristowe reference (U.S. Pat. No. 4,213,837). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite that the gel coat composition contains certain amounts of two different uv inhibitors. Such a limitation is not disclosed in or suggested by a combination of the references. Amended claim 26 recites two inhibitors not disclosed or suggested by the references. The other rejected claims depend from claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2005

By: Mark A. Frentrop  
Mark A. Frentrop, Reg. No. 41,026  
Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MAF/cg